

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD---OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.

BOSTON, FRIDAY, JULY 26, 1844.

linghyngsen, the friend also of abolitionism, for which he spurns at Texas, will be overwhelmed by the unanimous vote of the South.

The resolution for the annexation of Texas received the unanimous vote of the convention and I have no doubt but that they will receive the united voice of all Louisianians, as their safety and happiness depend upon it.

The nominations have received a hearty response throughout the Union. I think Polk and Dallas will get 30 States and the rest will be for the *Old Texas* as be the watchword, and victory is certain.

Your friend sincerely,

ANDREW JACKSON.

We find the following in the Charleston Observer of July 6.

Proposed Southern Convention.

At a meeting of the citizens of Russell county, Alabama, on the 8th of June, a preamble and resolutions were offered by General James Hamilton, and adopted without a dissenting voice, in which it is proposed that 'a Convention of the Southern States shall assemble in Richmond, Va. on the 3d Monday in October, to take into consideration the situation of the Southern States in reference to the institution of domestic slavery existing among them there calmly and dispassionately to deliberate whether, under the compact of Union, the Congress of the United States have a right to violate the spirit of compromise between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States, without which the Constitution could never have been adopted, by tolerating the institution of domestic slavery existing among any form in its deliberation, and whether a body designed to promote the interest of all the States can be made the theatre for endangering the security of any of them, and the arena where they may be made the objects of insult and reproval.'

The same paper contains a letter put forth by the Alabama meeting, in which they propose that 'the Southern States would invite an open, calm, frank, and temperate discussion of their rights, under the compact of the Union, to the entire security, for the institution of domestic slavery existing among them within limits, exempt from the hostile legislation of the Free States, and the no less hostile action of foreign nations.'

It would seem, that the South claim the protection of the general government, not merely against the movements of the anti-slavery societies, but against 'the legislation of the Free States, and 'the action of foreign nations.'—*Glean's Advocate.*

[Senator McDuffie has been making one of his characteristic speeches at Richmond, Va. on Northern oppression of the South, Texas indispensable to the latter, disunion, &c. &c. The Northern people and the tariff were shockingly blackguarded. He only wants the South to unite on Polk and Texas, and she can demolish the tariff in a twinkling,—or, as he modestly says—

'When the day shall come that the people of the South shall rise up and say to their plunderers of the North, 'Hands off! all will be well. No cry of 'Disunion' will then come from the North. When the six States of the South, namely, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama and Mississippi are united, you will see the North begging upon its knees that it may remain in the Union. They will pray to you, and some of them more fervently than they ever prayed to their God, that you will remain to them to be members of the Union. This will be the voice of the North when the South is united.'

MORE TREASON.—At a late meeting in Lancaster District, South Carolina, after numerous fiery resolves to dissolve the Union, if Texas was not annexed, that the Union, it was resolved, in event of war, that the States should rise up in arms, and triumph over the place of the Montezuma (city of Mexico). So that the acquisition of Texas and the dismemberment of this glorious Union, are not the only objects of these immaculate patriots and distinguished statesmen. A war of plunder and spoliation will then be waged against our southern neighbor, and all her territories will be wrested from her by the arm of force!—*Richmond Whig.*

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.—The Boston Atlas, the leading Whig paper in New-England, says—

'We shall certainly consider the annexation of Texas, or any other Foreign State, to this country as a virtual dissolution of the Union, and we apprehend that such a vast addition to our territory and population would so far change the nature and circumstances of the compact as to absolve the dissenting States from any further obligation under the original contract of the Union.'

From the Boston Daily Times, of 1835.

SLAVERY IN TEXAS.—Some people are so affect to be much surprised that the southern and south-western members of Congress are so unanimous in their wish that Texas may become an independent State. The problem, if it is one, is of very easy solution. If it can be severed from the Mexican Government, it will be a vast slave market—we had almost said a *menagerie* for the production of black cattle. It can be united to our republic, it would be, ere the lapse of many years, cut up into colored man States with constitutions like those of Arkansas and Missouri, entailing upon the whole population eternal slavery. The north and west ought to raise its voice against such a project which, if successful, would subject them forever to the domination of the slaveholding States.'

[This was the opinion of the Boston Times in 1835. Since then, 'Times is changed.'—Presidential high might, upon the paper, and a lucrative office in the Custom house to the publisher, to Tyler and Texas, slavery and black cattle.

The Letter of Mr. Dallas.—The meanest demagogue should blush to be accused of writing such a pitiful, pitiful piece of electioneering stuff. 'Solely for the purpose of business before us, we feel tempted to knock the man who wrote from "what little we know of him, we regarded as at least above a willing slave. To his overcare we leave him.—*Spirit of Liberty*

The Northern Advocate at Auburn has been adopted by the N. Y. Convention of the M. E. Church as an official organ; we hereafter will be known as the Northern Christian Advocate. Rev. N. Rounds, editor, The editor, in his 'introductory,' says: 'Anti-slavery in principle, it (the Advocate) will have no sympathy with modern Abolitionism.' This is sufficiently explicit to indicate the editor's course.

HEAR! HEAR! Extract from Henry Clay's last speech at Raleigh:

On the subject of Abolition, I am persuaded it is not necessary to say one word to this enlightened assemblage. My opinion was fully expressed in the Senate of the United States a few years ago, and the expression of it was one of the assigned causes of my not receiving the nomination as candidate for the presidency of December 1824. But, if there be any one who doubts, or desires to obtain further information about my views in respect to that unfortunate question, I refer him to Mr. Mendallah, of Richmond, Indiana.

The New York Tribune says—'Mr. Fralingshyngsen, in any way connected with the abolitionists, nor claimed by them as inclined to their school. On the contrary, his consistent, untiring attachment to the colonization cause has rendered him odious to humanity from them.'

CELEBRATION AT HINGHAM.

1st August, 1844.
The following gentlemen have been appointed to superintend the celebration at Hingham, on the 1st of August, and they are earnestly requested to use their best exertions to secure a large attendance from their respective counties:—

- AIDS.**
NATHAN LINCOLN, HENRY W. WILLIAMS, JAMES HITCHCOCK, JR., WILLIAM C. NELL.
COUNTY MARSHALS.
Plymouth.
EDWARD T. PERRY, of Hanson.
Suffolk.
HARRY I. BOWDITCH, of Boston.
Norfolk.
ELIAS RICHARDS, of Weymouth.
Essex.
JAMES N. BUTTER, of Lynn.

The place of rendezvous for the Norfolk delegation will be at Weymouth, Old Spain; and for Plymouth County at SOUTH HINGHAM; where those friends who attend the celebration in their own vehicles are requested to assemble precisely at half past 1 o'clock, and proceed together to Hingham, under the direction of the Chief Marshals of their counties. Arrangements will be made for providing for the care of the horses of those who attend, at a reduced charge, but no obstacle may prevent an anxious member of all who love the cause and desire to advance its progress.

After leaving their vehicles, the delegations from the towns in Norfolk and Plymouth counties will assemble in FOUNTAIN SQUARE, where a procession will be formed at 9 o'clock, and proceed a short distance, accompanied by the Dedham Pic-Nic Band, to receive the delegations from Suffolk and Essex counties.

The Grand Procession will be formed immediately after the disembarkation of the Suffolk delegation, and will proceed through the principal streets to TANGLEWOOD GROVE, where a Pic-Nic Collation will be provided, and the remainder of the day devoted to exercises of a highly interesting character.

Among the eloquent and devoted advocates of our cause who are expected to address the assembly are: WEDDILL PHILLIPS, WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, EDWARD QUINCY, CHARLES L. REMOND, and JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

Addresses will also be made by the HUTCHINSONS, Freedom's own vocalists, in the peculiar style of eloquence for which they are so justly celebrated.

Musical by the Instrumental Bands, and by a select choir, will also be introduced, to give variety to the exercises.

At all similar occasions, the refreshments will be furnished by those who attend the Pic-Nic, each contributing a proportion. Those who find it more convenient to send their provisions previously to the day of the celebration, can forward them, either to Hingham, or to the Anti-Slavery Office, Boston; where a subscription may also be found by those who prefer to make donations in money for the payment of the expenses of the Festival, rather than furnish a portion of the refreshments.

The delegation from Suffolk county will leave LIVERPOOL WHARF, at the foot of Pearl-street, at eight o'clock, in the steamer General Lincoln, or in two persons if necessary, and will stop for a moment at Fort Boston, to receive the friends from Essex county. The Essex delegation will leave Salem and Lynn in cars, at seven and a half o'clock, and will remain at Fort Boston until the arrival of the steamer from Hingham. The fare from Salem to Boston will be reduced one half.

From Boston and Hingham and back, price of passage will be only eighteen cents each way. Tickets for the cars from Salem, and for the steamer to Hingham, may be procured of James N. Buffum, Esq., or of Eliza J. Knolly, Salem.

To sit for the steamer to and from Hingham may be obtained at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 25 Cornhill, and all are requested to procure them previous to the first.

The Boston delegation will be accompanied by a fine band of music.

If the weather prove unfavorable, the celebration will take place the first fair day.

The delegates from Plymouth and Norfolk counties will, as previously announced, in Fountain Square, at 9 o'clock, and will proceed a short distance to receive the representatives of Suffolk and Essex counties; but they will remain in their ranks, that no further delay may be experienced in forming the Grand Order of March, than will be necessary to give time for formation to Suffolk and Essex counties.

The various towns will form, under their respective leaders, in alphabetical order, with the exception that the friends in Hingham will precede the Procession, as a secret.

The Chief Marshal takes this opportunity of urging especially upon the friends in Plymouth and Norfolk counties, the absolute necessity of punctuality in arriving at the hour appointed; and of expressing the hope that all who are not prevented by physical inability, will take place in the Procession.

The Grand Procession will be formed as follows:

Chief Marshal. Aid. Marshal of Plymouth. Aid. Marshal of Essex County. Delegates from Essex. The splendid Banner of the American Society. Aid. Marshal of Suffolk. Aid. Delegates from Suffolk. Aid. Delegates from Norfolk County.

All towns are requested to appoint their Marshals and Standard Bearers before the day of the Festival. JAIROS LINCOLN, Chief Marshal.

Suffolk County.
The persons named below are invited to act as Marshals to the Suffolk delegation, on the first of August, at Hingham; and they are requested to report themselves at the Anti-Slavery Office, on or before Tuesday, 20th instant:

- James Baxter, Jun. Edmund Jackson, Cornelius Bramhall, Benj. P. Bassett, Benj. W. Gage, Robert Morris, Daniel N. Haskell, John Curtis, Jun., S. B. Kendall, John G. King, George Bartlett, John L. Emmons.

All persons are desired to procure tickets at 25, Cornhill, immediately, that adequate arrangements may be made for transportation.

HENRY I. BOWDITCH, Chief Marshal Suffolk Co.

CELEBRATION AT CONCORD.
To the Friends of Freedom in Middlesex and the neighboring Counties.

All who feel interested in the slave's welfare and the progress of human rights, of whatever sex, age, or character, are invited to meet at Concord, on the approaching 1st of August, to celebrate the anniversary of the emancipation of 800,000 slaves in the British West Indies—an event the most noble of modern times, which appeals to the noblest feelings of the heart; which was stained with no blood, and achieved by no physical strife, but accomplished by the wonder-working power of truth and elevated justice; which has caused no tears to flow but joy, unless the tyrant weeps over future bloodshed; which has proved that obedience to the laws of God is for man's best interest; which has

raised thousands from the position of brutes to that of men, and carried the light of knowledge and Christianity to the homes of thousands in darkness before; and which is, in fact, the crowning glory of Christianity in this age.

The exercises will commence at 11 o'clock, and will consist of singing by an anti-slavery choir, and an address by RALPH WALDO EMERSON. At noon, there will be a collation in the woods—tickets 25 cents—and afterwards, addresses by John Pierpont, S. J. May, F. Douglass, George Bradburn, W. A. White, Walter Channing, and other distinguished friends of liberty.

It is desirable that the friends who propose coming, should send an estimate of the number that will probably attend from their respective towns, that suitable provision may be made. Please address WM. A. WHITE, Watertown, or Mrs. M. M. BROOKS, Concord.

Colored Citizens' Celebration of First of August.
The anniversary of British West India Emancipation will be celebrated by the Colored Citizens of Boston on the 1st of August, by public addresses, and a Soiree in the evening.

The colored citizens and friends of freedom will assemble at the Baptist meeting-house in Belknap-street at 1 o'clock. A procession will be formed, and pass through Cambridge, Charles, Beacon and Park streets, to the Tremont Chapel, where addresses will be delivered by several gentlemen who are engaged for the occasion. Friends of the cause in the city and country are invited to be present.

A Soiree will be held in the evening, to commence at 8 o'clock. Tickets 50 cents each. It is expected that Mr. Garrison will address the audience on the occasion. Let all come who feel disposed to pass an agreeable evening. The Soiree will be held in the Infant School Room.

FIRST OF AUGUST IN NEW-BEDFORD.
A Pic Nic will be held at Parker's Grove, New-Bedford, to which the friends in the neighboring towns are invited on the First of August, to celebrate the emancipation of the slaves in the British West Indies.

Speakers are expected from abroad to address the gathering on that occasion.

The Procession will move from the New Town Hall.

Per order of Committee.
New-Bedford, July 24, 1844.

The Glorious Jubilee.
On Thursday next, the anniversary of British West India Emancipation will be celebrated in this region with unusual demonstrations of joy and gratitude. The gathering at Hingham bids fair to be truly immense. Plymouth and Norfolk are resolved on presenting an array, formidable as to tyrants—and Suffolk and Essex will not be found wanting on the scene of zeal and numbers. At Concord, there will doubtless be a great concourse. In the morning, an address will be delivered by Ralph Waldo Emerson, which we presume will supply repay making a long journey to hear. Other addresses will be delivered by John Pierpont, George Bradburn, Frederick Douglass, Samuel J. May, Wm. A. White, Walter Channing, and others. This is a strong phalanx. The speakers at Hingham will be Wendell Phillips, Chas. L. Remond, W. L. Garrison, James Freeman Clarke, &c. &c. The Hutchinsons will be present on the occasion, to sing the songs of jubilee in their unquenchable strains. [See the Programme, in the preceding column.]

Two events to be celebrated constitute a brilliant era in the history of the human race, and will make the nineteenth century illustrious to the end of time. Every freeman should have the return of the first of August with exultation, and consecrate it to the deliverance of our enslaved countrymen, and of all who are pinning in bondage, wherever they may be. Especially should abolitionists spare no pains or expense to celebrate it in a becoming manner. They should make their arrangements as to rally en masse, bringing with them a host of honest inquirers. It should be a day for a NUMERICAL AS WELL AS A MORAL DEMONSTRATION—the grand muster day and general review of all our anti-slavery forces. Let every man, woman and child resolve to turn out. On such a thrilling occasion, do not mind the distance, time or expense. **ALL OUT!** is the word.

Our colored friends in this city are to have a special celebration, and in the evening a Soiree, at which they hope to see many of their white friends.

Our Bristol county countrymen are to have a grand Pic Nic at New-Bedford. Let them not allow themselves to be outdone by any of the other counties.

Let it not be forgotten that it is expected of those who go to Hingham, that they will carry provisions with them, or contribute in money before the time to help defray the expenses. At Concord, the dinner is to be provided by tickets, at 25 cents each.

Middlesex Standard.
The first number of a new paper, with this title, to be devoted to the interests of the Liberty party, and edited by JONAS G. WHITTIER, is before us. It is to be published weekly, in Lowell, at \$1.50 per annum. Our views of the Liberty party are so well known, as to render it superfluous for us to say that we regret to see our friend Whittier giving his countenance. Politically, the party is as needless as a fifth wheel to a coach, and its moral effect on our great movement is highly injurious, because it changes a moral into a political conflict, and diverts attention from the bulwarks of American slavery. Besides, we are against every party that is for supporting the present Constitution of the United States and the existing American Union. The true issue, both politically and religiously, is—No union with slaveholders!—and the sooner it is met by all the friends of emancipation, the sooner will the slaves be set free. Friend Whittier says, "the Liberty party recognizes the inestimable worth of man as man—the brotherhood and equality of our race." Now, that party differs from the Whig and Democratic parties only as to the question of southern slavery. Like them, it unfurls the stars and stripes. Is that banner an emblem of "the brotherhood of our race?" Like them, it goes for an army and navy. Are these friendly to the human brotherhood? Like them, it is geographical in its patriotism and philanthropy, and strenuous for that accused nationality, which has filled the earth with wars, and covered it with human blood. Like them, it disregards the sacred rights of women, and gives them no voice either in the choice of rulers, or in the enactment and administration of the laws—notwithstanding it is affirmed in the Declaration of Independence, that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." We see nothing of the recognition of "the brotherhood of the race" in such a party—and therefore we are against it.

It has long been to us a mystery, how a Quaker can elector in favor of a government which is based on military power, and relies for its safety on an army and navy, and grants "letters of marque and reprisal," and makes the President commander-in-chief of all the military and naval forces, and writes its edicts in human blood, and disregards all the injunctions and precepts of the gospel of peace. Our friend Whittier, we think, ought to divorce himself from such a government, or give up his Quakerism.

Imprisonment of Charles T. Torrey.
A citizen of Massachusetts, late incarcerated in a lunatic asylum in Maryland, charged with the high misdemeanor of having endeavored to "deliver him that is spoiled out of the hands of the oppressor," and to set the human free—no, however, by any act of violence, but in the spirit of good will to the oppressed, and without injury to the oppressor. A demand for his person has been made upon the Executive of Maryland by the Executive of Virginia, in order that he may be tried by the laws of the latter State; but whether the requisition will be complied with is yet a matter of uncertainty. Between "the upper and the nether millstones," he is undoubtedly in great danger of being crushed, no matter how innocent he may be of the charge now preferred against him. In a case like this, no great amount of evidence is needed to convict him; for "trifles light as air" will be regarded "as strong as proofs from holy writ" by the slavesholding banditti who have made him their captive. I know, by experience, what chance he has for a fair trial and a speedy release. I spent forty-nine days in the same prison in which he is now confined, and the cell which I occupied had just been vacated by a murderer. My crime was, in declaring the domestic slave trade as bad in principle, and as atrocious in practice, as the foreign traffic; in saying that they who were engaged in the former, were deserving of the same punishment as had been decreed to those who should be caught in the trade on the coast of Africa; in stating that the ship Francis, of Newburyport, (my native place), had sailed from the port of Baltimore with a cargo of seventy-five slaves, confined in the usual manner, for the New-Orleans market; and in severely denouncing the owner and master of that vessel. On my trial, I proved by the custom-house books that eighty-eight, instead of seventy-five slaves had been transported in the Francis; but of what value was evidence under such circumstances? I was tried before a slavesholding judge, (Nicholas Brice, notorious for his enmity to the cause of emancipation), and pronounced guilty by a packed jury of slavesholders and slave-traders, who sentenced me to pay a fine of one thousand dollars, in addition to my seven weeks' imprisonment. Mr. Torrey, as an avowed abolitionist, has just as good a chance of receiving a fair trial, whether in Baltimore or Richmond, as a lamb in the embrace of a wolf has of being at liberty, without any bodily harm.

I can think of nothing that will be likely to work in his favor, except the apprehension that may justly be felt by the court, that in case of his conviction and punishment in the penitentiary, a fresh excitement will be produced against slavery throughout the country—a specimen of which has somewhat recently been given in the case of John L. Brown, of South Carolina, on both sides of the Atlantic. True, it was mainly the sentence of death pronounced on Brown, that caused the deep sensation of horror that ensued; but the fact that he was even arraigned as a felon, for performing so meritorious an act, in this professionally christian and democratic country, excited universal abhorrence and astonishment throughout Europe. Mr. Torrey is to be tried on a similar charge, and ought to receive the sympathy and aid of all who, being in bondage, would bless the hand that should be extended to break their fetters.

Circumstances have occurred in the painful divisions which have taken place in the anti-slavery ranks, to impair my confidence in Mr. Torrey as a true-hearted abolitionist. Probably, of all the false friends who have lifted up their heels against me—the host of enemies who have maliciously sought to destroy my influence in the anti-slavery cause, by covertly assailing and misrepresenting my religious sentiments—no one has surpassed him in the venom or subtlety of his attacks upon me, especially during his agency in behalf of the Massachusetts Abolition Society. But care nothing for the past. He is now in distress and in prison, on a charge which, if it be true, is highly creditable to his courage and humanity, but which may doom him to many years' confinement in the penitentiary. I feel as ready to expose his cause as though he were my bosom friend; for, an occurrence like this does not admit of hostility or doubt, or justify the slightest personal alienation of mind. He shall have my aid toward procuring all necessary pecuniary assistance, and I hope will have a host ready to come up to his aid. Let all the anti-slavery journals speak out in thunder tones on this subject.

Stereotype Edition.
"The Brotherhood of These; or, A True Picture of the American Church and Clergy." By Stephen S. Foster. Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, Cornhill—1844. pp. 72.

Several editions of this work having been exhausted by a rapid sale, the author has had it stereotyped, so that it may be scattered at a cheap rate throughout the country. Although the boldness of the charge contained in its title page is calculated at first to offend and astonish those who have never examined the connection of the American church and clergy with the slave system, yet every candid reader who shall carefully weigh its facts and arguments in the scales of eternal justice, must confess that Mr. Foster has fully substantiated his charge, and exonerated himself from the imputation of being a false witness. The evidence which he has accumulated against these corrupt bodies has been taken from their own documents and proceedings, and not from any foreign source; and they stand, therefore, condemned out of their own mouths.

Yet Mr. Foster has not presented one hundredth part of the amount that might be brought in confirmation of his position; for volumes would be required to contain it all. The work has excited a good deal of howling among "the brethren"—but no one has yet ventured to come forward to disprove its allegations, or expose the unsoundness of its reasoning. It admits of no refutation; and being true, what course remains for those who fear God and work righteousness, but to CONCUR with our American Babylon, that they may not be partakers of her sins, and thus may escape her plagues?

A more potent weapon against the enslavers of our fettered countrymen cannot be found than this comprehensive and most instructive pamphlet; and it should be in the hand of every reformer, and especially of every "CONVERTED" Abolitionist in all parts of the country should procure copies of it, and circulate them without delay among the people, that the ears of the deaf may hear, that the eyes of the blind may see, and that the maimed and the halt may be enabled to walk "in the light of the Lord," and in the path of liberty and love.

Out at Last.
From the moment Martin Van Buren was so wantonly thrown overboard, and James K. Polk chosen as the democratic leader, by the Baltimore Convention, the anti-slavery journals affirmed that it was solely the Texas question that effected this extraordinary result. In the letter of Andrew Jackson, on our first page, addressed to Gen. Plache, of Louisiana, he "lets the cat out of the bag" as follows:—[It "Had [Mr. Van Buren] come out for immediate annexation, he would have received the unanimous vote of the convention as a candidate for the Presidency."] This tells the whole story in a single sentence. Mr. Van Buren, for once, with great deference, caution and reluctance, ventured to differ with Gen. Jackson on the mere question of time as to the annexation; and for this he has been cast aside with indignation and contempt! It is now clear as the noon-day sun, that Polk received the nomination at Baltimore, by the dictation of "Andrew Jackson," who, while pretending to be friendly to the election of Mr. Van Buren, was secretly plotting for his rejection. "Et tu, Brute?" For a definition of "American democracy," therefore, see Texas—which means PERPETUAL SLAVERY!

In the same letter, which is a precious specimen of profligacy, selfishness and cowardice, Gen. Jackson utters the palpable falsehood, that Mr. Frelinghuysen is "the friend also of abolition." But why should he strain at a single misstatement, when he can so easily swallow Texas, with all its oppression and villany? This "hero of New-Orleans" is manifestly any thing but a brave and good man.

ABBY KELLEY. All letters and papers intended for Abby Kelley should be directed to her at Dorset, N. H. until further notice.

Another Trial!

WEST BROOKFIELD, July 7, 1844.
FRIEND GARRISON:—Some of your readers may recollect an account published in the Liberator, a few weeks since, of a litigation between the Commonwealth and myself for the offence charged upon me, of disturbing the public worship of God, of which I was convicted before a magistrate, and duly suffered the penalty. The magistrate alluded to pronouncing your paper a scurrilous sheet, for the reason undoubtedly of the admission of that act, and, complains most bitterly of being maliciously slandered in the affair.

Of all topics for a print, intended for the public eye, and intended to have a salutary impression upon the public mind, through a widely diffused circulation, that of personal altercation between individuals, occupying a humble and an obscure sphere in the world, I believe to be the most uninteresting and the least profitable. Whenever it shall appear to you that I propose to descend to personalities for the object of revenge, or to gratify any improper prejudice I have imbibed, I will be obliged to you to dash out such as may savour of that, and, if you please, the whole for the sake of that.

It may be necessary for the advancement of principles, that the specific actions of individuals, in some cases, be spread before the public mind, in illustration of the operations of a wrong system. Whoever throws himself in the way of the progress of reform, and desires to be considered a willing obstruction to such reform, certainly ought to hold himself amenable to public opinion, and be willing to have his actions fully exposed.

I have just now narrowly escaped the infliction of another penalty for a like offence. I propose to inform your readers of the state of religion in this place at the present time. I think I can do so by showing what it takes to disturb a religious meeting, and break it up, and disperse it.

Two weeks since, at a third religious meeting, an excommunicated deacon asked leave of the minister to make an inquiry, which the minister was not pleased to notice with the glance of his eye, or the answer of his tongue. A second effort met with the same success. Being present, I advised the minister, in imitation of Jesus Christ, to answer the man; whereupon the minister declared the meeting dissolved, and we respectively departed for our respective places of abode, and arrived safely thither.

The revolution of a few suns brought the magistrate's corporal, with a citation for the deacon and myself to appear before his honor, and answer to the offences laws of Church and State! The magistrate before alluded to had now turned informer and complainant, and appeared before the Court as attorney for the Commonwealth. He exhibited a zeal for the conviction and punishment of the deacon, which would be commendable in any good cause. The facts developed in the trial were mainly these:—That deacon Joseph Henshaw had been an active member in the church in this place, for a long series of years, and had discharged the duties devolved upon him in a respectable and acceptable manner; that it had been common for him to take part in the religious exercises of meetings of the kind at which the offence was committed, and also to conduct them in the absence of the clergyman; and that it was a common and established usage of the church to solicit and urge, through its minister, the free exercise of remark and a free participation in all its exercises; that deacon Henshaw improved these privileges in common with others, to the acceptance of all concerned; that a curtailment of these privileges was suggested some five years since by the minister, in consequence of the introduction of the subject of American slavery into meetings appointed for prayer for the conversion of the whole world, and that an increasing restraint upon lay members had taken place, until free remarks were discontinued; that deacon Henshaw had made himself disagreeable to the church by his advocacy of anti-slavery doctrines and his connection with the anti-slavery society, and had been excommunicated for that cause, and for that only; that an ecclesiastical council had adjudged upon his conduct, and the action of the church in his case, and had unanimously decided that he ought to be restored to good standing in the church, and recommended to the church so to do. It appeared that the church had never adopted the recommendation of the council, nor taken action upon it. The evidence was, that deacon Henshaw was, of right, virtually a member of the church, in good standing. No impeachment of his character or conduct was attempted, saving the charge of having made several attempts, of late, to get an opportunity to speak in extra meetings of the minister, which once bore a social character, but are now invariably superintended by a paid theologian, who watches every movement with as much vigilance as would the keeper of an insane retreat watch his patients, if quartered in the armory of a company of fanatics. It appeared, furthermore, that the Anti-Slavery Society of this place, of which deacon Henshaw is president, has enjoyed the privilege of holding a meeting in the church vestry on the evening of one Sabbath in each month, for some five years, until last spring, when the society, through the influence of the priesthood, voted them out, under the pretence of wanting it for their own use. It was sheer pretence, however, as they have their regular place of meeting above, and equally convenient, which they could quite as well improve. But, to make it certain that they did not turn out the anti-slavery meeting for their own convenience merely, the anti-slavery people were denied the privilege of holding a session, after the last meeting of the clergyman had closed, which would discommodate no one. The committee testified that they were forbidden to grant the use of the vestry to any body or any individual, on the Sabbath, and that they had refused the use of it to the anti-slavery friends after the close of the third meeting, on the day of the disturbance, or on any other Sunday. The minister, a Rev. Mr. Parker, testified that he declined giving notice of an anti-slavery collection to be taken on that evening, because it was against the established rules of the church, to admit any thing into the vestry on the Sabbath, but a religious meeting, and he was not disposed to do any thing conflicting with the action of the majority. Yet the person, in his simplicity, testified that he expected that day to hold his meeting out of the vestry, as the parish had let it for some weeks figure exhibition. His meeting, however, contrary to his expectation, was held in the vestry. It is surmised that some one or more brought themselves that, to vote the Anti-Slavery Society out of the vestry on all holy times, and to deny them the privilege of the hall for the fourth course, after the people had been seated with evangelical feasting, and then to let the hall for the shows of an itinerant lecturer, would not help to prove the sincerity of their anti-slavery professions. The mummies were removed that day, and the hall "swept and garnished," and the multitude assembled to perform their devotions in increased numbers.

The Anti-Slavery Society has not relinquished the plan of taking up a monthly collection in aid of the cause, although they have not been able to hold a meeting of their own. As the only feasible course, they have taken the collection in connexion with the minister's meeting.

On the Sabbath alluded to, Rev. Mr. Parker rather craved the privilege of giving the notice of our collection, in order, probably, to save some layman the trouble of making himself conspicuous, while the minister waited for him to give what he has heretofore considered a contraband notice. He dictated one to suit himself, and gave it. That the anti-slavery friends would take up their collection in the usual manner. The usual manner has been to take it up on that day, at the hour and place that meeting was held, and has been the first business of the meeting. He made no appointment for himself, having, forget it, as he says, in making these comments upon

the anti-slavery notice. He was punctual, however, at the ringing of the bell, and as though the salvation of the parish depended upon the expeditious movements of his meeting, he waited for nothing, not even for the collection he had notified.

After some of the exercises had been gone through, and at a suitable opening, the deacon signified his wish to ask a question, when a response was given to the assembly by the minister, that "he loved the cause of the slave," and if he could be permitted, he would discourse to them about it—when the meeting was brought to a close, as before stated. I had the pleasure of hearing him discourse to his employers on "the cause of the slave" on the following Sabbath, or, rather, I might say, on the character of the slaves' friends; and, surely, I fear if I had as contemptible an opinion of them as he exhibited, I should seldom, if ever, look at them.

The magistrate before whom the culprits were brought, (Pardon Keyes, Esq.) a very clever man, heard the arguments upon both sides with a considerable degree of patience; and in commenting upon the circumstances to come to a verdict, he remarked that, in all his experience, he had never known of an individual presuming to speak in a religious meeting, without the consent or invitation of the minister, save one instance, which occurred in his own town, about thirty-five years ago—that it occasioned a tremendous excitement at the time, and that, in consequence of threats of instituting a prosecution, the offender was induced to make an apology, (to the clergyman, I suppose), and that settled it. Consequently, he felt it his duty (as was anticipated from his relation to society and the church) to impose a "moderate fine" of five dollars! This sentence seemed to appease the complainant, who proposed to withdraw the complaint against myself, provided I would say I had no wicked intent in the part which I took in the transaction, which I cheerfully complied with. I had prepared myself with counsel to defend before the magistrate, in the person of Charles Lenox Remond, who, pending the trial of the deacon, had delivered one of his most eloquent lectures in behalf of the slave. The complainant, who is not thoroughly versed in anti-slavery matters, (and who, by the way, drew all his precedents from the newspaper reports of Elder Lamson and Abigail Folsom), chose to withdraw his action against me, and give my lawyer the whole field to himself, and very generously proposed, as chairman of the parish committee, to grant the use of the vestry for friend Remond to deliver a lecture, as a substitute for the trial. Under any other circumstances, the anti-slavery friends would have had to pay one dollar for the room.

The court, complainant, witnesses and spectators, and a goodly company attended, and gave good audience for two hours to an eloquent lecture, setting forth the obstacles which anti-slavery has to encounter in the political, social and religious world; and he made a thrilling appeal to his hearers to break away from the pro-slavery influences which now surround them, and to come up to the help of the Lord against the abomination of American Christianity and republicanism.

I charged my friends and neighbors with so much gospel preaching and delivered them by friend Remond at my expense, and no better gospel do they get. It was my contribution to the missionary cause for evangelizing the world (not to say the heathen).

So, you see, we make some progress in reconciling the brethren to anti-slavery encroachments. My fine, a few months ago, for a like offence, was six dollars. The deacon's is but five, and the hall throws in for an anti-slavery lecture, which certainly reduces it to four dollars. Our next advance may be backward to human vision; nevertheless, we do progress.

The history of these transactions is important and valuable, only as it exposes the bitter hostility which is lurking in the church against the promulgation of anti-slavery doctrines.

A plain recital of facts, where ministers and churches lent their aid, and exerted their influence, to disparage the outspoken abolitionist, and thrust him out of their synagogues, and whatever they could to prevent his speaking at all, or teaching "these doctrines, even in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, I trust will, a few years hence, sound like idle tales; and there will come a time to claim the honor of having assisted in dragging to justice such incorrigible offenders as we now appear to many.

A minister of Jesus, forsooth, who pretends to love the cause of the slave, disdainful to notice an individual, who makes equally high pretensions to care for the slave; and that, too, upon an occasion devoted to the consideration of that specific subject—for the reason, it may be, that he fancies his theological dignity will be soiled by such condescension, or that his "craft is in danger to be set at naught," or that "the temple of the great goddess should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all America and the world worshippeth."

Well it was, surely, that Christ did not confine the casting out of evil spirits to his ordained followers, and happy would it be for them if they would bear in mind how easily his immediate disciples fell into that delusion.

J. M. FISKE.

Abington Anti-Slavery Society.
The eighth annual meeting of the Abington A. S. Society was held at the town house, in Abington, on Wednesday, July 10th, 1844. Samuel Reed, President of the Society, in the chair.

On motion of H. H. Brigham, a committee of three were chosen, on nomination of officers, viz—Lewis Ford, Micah H. Pool and John Noyes, Jr.

In the absence of the committee, the meeting was entertained by interesting remarks from the President. He alluded to the anti-slavery feeling at the east part of the town—the mighty obstacles the Society had to contend against, provided they are faithful to principle—the efforts of the clergy heretofore, to overthrow the Society, and their present misrepresentations of us and our conduct. But, said he, they have not succeeded—we yet live to maintain the principles of primitive abolition.

The committee on nomination made the following report:

President—Samuel Reed.
Vice-Presidents—John Corbitt, Solomon Ford and Samuel Dyer.
Secretary—H. H. Brigham.
Treasurer—J. J. Howland.
Directors—Christopher Dyer, Briggs Arnold, Rebecca T. Pool, Sarah Wilks, Daniel Holbrook, Catherine B. Norton, Eldridge Sprague. Accepted.

Voted to meet quarterly on Sabbath evenings.
Voted to choose a committee of three to assist the Secretary in giving notices of the meetings, viz—M. H. Pool, L. Ford, and John Underhay.

Voted that the officers of the Society, in case no place can be obtained to hold such meetings, be authorized to hire some hall or other suitable place. After attending to the business matters of the Society, voted to raise a committee of seven, to make arrangements, procure donations, &c., for celebrating the 1st of August, with the anti-slavery host at Hingham.

Voted, That we form a procession at Hingham on that occasion, and that the committee procure a banner, if thought best, bearing the following motto:—**NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS, RELIGIOUSLY OR POLITICALLY!**
The following persons constitute the committee of arrangements, viz—Samuel Dyer, Briggs Arnold, Lewis Ford, M. H. Pool, J. J. Howard, Thomas Norton, and H. H. Brigham.
Voted, That we invite the three bands of music in Abington to accompany us.
The following resolution was offered by H. H. Brigham: Resolved, That the Society do most fully concur in opinion with the New-England Convention, so far as it is in our power, to wit—that liberty

and slavery are antagonisms—that freedom can have no union with slaveholders—that the Constitution of the United States is a slavesholding instrument, and that no abolitionist can take office, vote, or swear to support it, without gross and palpable violation of the abolition principle.

The resolution was discussed by T. J. Howard, H. H. Brigham, Samuel Reed, and others; but, for want of time for more thorough discussion, was laid upon the table for further consideration at the next meeting.

The meeting was quite interesting, and a good spirit prevailed. The Society have taken important action, and are determined to assail pro-slavery wherever it may be found. We are greatly misrepresented and calumniated by the church and clergy, but, believing our cause a just one, based on truth immutable, we faint not, neither are we disheartened. Our motto is "Forward," and "No union with slaveholders!"
SAMUEL REED, Pres.
H. H. BRIGHAM, Sec.
South Abington, July 13, 1844.

To the Friends of a Re-Organization of Society
THAT SHALL SUBSTITUTE FRATERNAL CO-OPERATION FOR ANTAGONISTIC SELFISHNESS; A RELIGIOUS EXERCISE OF LIFE AND LABOR, SOUL AND BODY, TIME AND ETERNITY, IN HARMONY WITH THE LAWS OF GOD AND OF LIFE, INSTEAD OF FRAGMENTARY, SPASMODIC FIERY.

THE NORTHAMPTON ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY, having struggled through many obstacles incident to novel enterprises and especially to those that are opposed to ancient prejudices, feel themselves now on the threshold of success. Although they have heretofore been somewhat embarrassed by a debt of some magnitude, yet they now have the satisfaction of being able to announce that by recent subscriptions to their capital, and valuable accessions to their resources in other respects, they find themselves placed in a situation more favorable than ever before for pecuniary success.

A thoroughly organized system of labor has recently been introduced, which has given a great degree of efficiency to their industrial operations, and cannot fail of being attended with the most favorable results. Indeed, such is their present condition—so encouraging—so full of hope—that they feel an unwavering assurance of success; and in inviting others to unite with them, and to share with them in their enjoyments as well as in their labors, they feel confident that they are not inviting them to participate in a hazardous or doubtful experiment. They wish, without further delay, to make provision for extending their operations and increasing their numbers to something like their ultimate limits. With their present accommodations for dwellings, they can receive but few persons more. They must have a building for that purpose; and they wish now to make such definite arrangements as will enable them to commence immediately the erection of a commodious edifice, which they hope to see completed and occupied by 100 families before two years more shall have passed away. For this purpose, and to receive suggestions from their friends in reference to

POETRY.

THE CHILD'S BURIAL.

For the Liberator.

'Twas night o'er Georgia's fair bowers,
Where softly slept her fragrant flowers,
While calmly slept the moon above,
Upon the mossy covered ground;
And there was borne upon the breeze
Sweet fragrance from the orange tree,
And from the boughs above was heard
The singing of the evening bird,
Mingling with the luscious sound
Of the dark river's ceaseless bound:
All, all conspired to make the place
Blessed with every beautiful grace;
But, hark! comes there no sound to mar
The beauty of the place? From far
Is heard man's suffering wail—it tells
In this fair land of streams and dells,
Reigns slavery, with resistless power,
To those dark sons of our own land,
O'er whom we rule with stern command.
There comes in this lovely place
Two persons of the African race;
They bore their child—its soul had fled—
And now it slumbered with the dead;
They bore it there, a grave to find,
Where all things beautiful combined;
They laid their child beneath the flowers,
Away from strife where evil lowers;
Their words were few, their tears fell not
Upon that highly favored spot.
Strange it seemed, that a parent's heart
Could thus with its loved offspring part;
Then seated on the new-made mound,
They looked with cautious eye around.

'Dear Rachel, we shall see no more
Our lovely little boy,
Playing beside our humble door,
With countenance of joy.
When we return at close of day,
Oppressed with toil and heat,
No more he'll meet us on our way,
With footsteps light and fleet.

And with bounding heart, of late,
He sat down by our side,
'Till now indeed he doleful,
For he, our joy, has died!

We will not mourn that he has fled
And slumbered in the grave;
Since now we've laid him with the dead,
He cannot be a slave!

A bondman's lot he would have known,
With all its misery;
And o'er his pathway thickly strown,
Would want and suffering be.

But, sleeping here, he ne'er shall know
What 'tis to be a slave;
There ne'er will enter grief nor woe,
Within this peaceful grave.

'Ah, yes, Lamer, our little boy
Has fled from want and pain,
E'er sorrow could his peace destroy,
Or sin his soul could stain.

He's gone unto the world above,
Unto his Father God;
And resting in Eternal Love,
Now heaven's his bliss abode.

And when our tedious life is o'er,
Again our son we'll see,
And we shall part with him no more,
Throughout eternity.'

And kneeling down upon the sod,
They poured their souls in prayer to God;
They then returned to their dreary home,
To live as slaves till death should come.

C. R. G.

From the Hartford Times.

OLE BULL.

To Pean! to sing,
Honor to the Fiddle-King!
King, by 'right divine,' and holy,
All the world has crowned thee, Ole!

Had the Northern hordes of old,
Forth from Scandinavia cold,
Rushing like starved wolves for prey—
Had they, Ole, heard thee play,
They had ever kept at home—
They had never plundered Rome.

Hadst thou lived in those old days,
When music met such fitting praise,
The trees that moved at Orpheus' tones,
The trees and beasts, and senseless stones,
Nor would they have sought thee so—
Running would have been too slow;

They'd have 't'en from the railroad car,
And come to thee from near and far.

Whence the magic didst thou learn
All golden sounds to turn
All then touched—all to change
'T'into something rich and strange?

So said thy mournful measures flow,
We seem to hear, in strains below,
The Lord of ancient melody,
Lamenting loud Eurydice!

Yet when thou sarest free and high,
'As if native to the sky,'
We're sure Apollo's self has given
These lessons in the highest heaven!

Listening thy wild music, we
Mighty panoramas see,
And such sounds we seem to hear
As were too great for mortal ear;

Now a changeless streamlet's flow,
Rippling faint, murmuring, slow;
Now the little sounds advance,
Nimble as fairies in the dance,

And like the sunbeam's tiny notes,
Each in golden glory floats;
Now the sweetest sound doth seem
As of song heard in a dream;

Or the heart of lovers meet,
Beating music in the breast,
Both one measure—until we
Grow faint, as an overladen beam—
With excess of harmony;

And our minds to nervous air
Seem dissolved, and here and there
We sway and slide, without a will,
Slaves of slightest impulse, till—
Crash!—as when the thunder's stroke
Topples down the lofty oak,

And the quivering birds dart out
From their nests upon our boughs—
Such our fancy's fearful rout
At that startling sound—
Our souls are driven, like an ocean
Before the hurricane's fierce motion—
Wild, louder, grows the storm—
Every sound, and every form,
As terribly we sweep along,
Mingle like a maelstrom throng;

Norway's awful whirlpool roars,
Like the lake that hath no shores;
Norway's vast black rocks arise,
Like hell-mouths roaring to the skies!

To Pean! to sing,
Honor to the Minstrel-King!
Thousand years shall come and go,
Thousand nations shall be low,
And new races shall arise,
From seed Time scatters as she flies;
Old stars shall fall, and new ones bloom—
Flowers o'er the world's gigantic tomb!

But men shall ever wait in vain

To look upon thy like again

Another Homer may arise—

Another Newton light the skies—

Another Venus burst the foam—

Another Otis ne'er shall come!

REFORMATORY.

Thoughts on Peace and War.

We are indebted to Dr. WALTER CHANNING, of Boston, for a copy of his admirable Address delivered before the American Peace Society, at its annual meeting, May 27, 1844, from which we take the following extracts:

In the most touching, and, at the same time, sublime passage in the life of Christ, his visible consecration to his mission to man, his baptism, a word came from the excellent majesty of heaven, and that word was peace! 'On earth, peace, good-will to men.' Christ went out of the waters of baptism with the investiture of peace. He went up, and passed under the cloud of the shadow of death, in his great ministry of life to the world, but peace went up with him, and he never laid aside that beautiful garment, his robe of salvation. When about to be offered up, the sacrifice, among his disciples, and to sacred bequest of divine legacy to his disciples, and to us amongst them, peace had its august place. The first word in his ministry, it was the last of his life—'Peace I leave with you.'

You ask no comment. The record is with you unto the end of the age. You ask not a word more—not a letter, a syllable of explanation, or of enforcement of the word from that evangelist. My Christian brethren, you are filled, you are satisfied with that. Do not ask, if the Church, the visible body of Christ, has been true to that last, divine testament, that blessed legacy. I do not ask, if men and women here assembled, have been followers after peace, and in its divine guidance have lived in great blessing and in great peace, and what we so freely received. We have come together, that we might think and speak, to of this great theme, this Christian grace, and chief element, peace. Let us further speak of it, and commend it, as we may be able, to the reverence, the love, the obedience of each other, and of all within our reach.

I cannot well omit speaking, for a moment, of a recent occurrence which has some bearing on the subject of peace in its Christian relations. I refer to the debate in Congress, on that portion of the appropriation bill which provides for the pay of army and navy chaplains. A member from Indiana, named Pettit, moved to strike out the clause, on the ground that Christianity denounces war; enforced the obligation of peace under whatever provocation; requiring that evil should never be resisted, but that it should be overcome with good. In other words, he showed how utterly inconsistent it was with the whole spirit of Christianity to have its doctrines taught to armies—to bodies of men collected together and supported for the express purpose of violating a fundamental principle of Christianity, which commands us to save life, not to kill.

When the member had said down, many others followed each other in rapid succession in defence of Christianity, and in defence of the appropriation, on Christian grounds. The member from Indiana was called an infidel—his speech was pronounced an insult, nothing was judged too bad to be charged upon that member for his anti-Christian argument, so called, against the appropriation for the army and navy chaplains. In the course of the debate a member rose, not to defend the Indiana member, but to defend Christianity against its friends. His speech was dignified, solemn, reverential. He rebuked the spirit in which our religion has been perverted, and felt grateful for so much wisdom, so much true piety. Who does not, with that honorable member, see the inconsistency of the public sanction of war, or of its preparation, which comes of connecting with it in any way the religion of the Prince of Peace? Who does not sympathize with that 'infidelity,' if such it be, which, in the speech of that member from Indiana, declares that the Christian religion is a religion of armies and navies, with Christianity; and which denounced the gross waste which an appropriation was, and ever must be, for paying the salaries of their chaplains?

Few single facts in our public history are more instructive, or have so deeper meaning, than that Congress debate on the connection between war and Christianity. Let the friends of peace keep it in mind.

I have spoken of war and of the soldier, as they appear to me. Bear with me, while I read a short extract of a living author, Douglas Jerrold, who, with Sidney Smith, and Albany Fonblaque, and others, have devoted noble minds, and the keenest satire, wit, and humor, to the cause of humanity:

'Now look aside,' says Jerrold, 'and contemplate God's image with a musket! What a fine looking thing is war! Yes, dress it as you may, dress and feather it, dabb it with gold, huzz it, and sing swagging songs about it—what is it, nine times out of ten, but murder in uniform, in making the war, the soldier's shilling? . . . Yet, O man of war! at this very moment, you are shivering, withering, like an aged giant. The fingers of Opinion have been busy at your plumes;—you are not the feathered thing you were; and then this little tube, the goose-quill, has sent its silent shots into your very anatomy; and, as the goose-quill, you are now a quill, and think it shines so brightly, is eating, with a tooth of iron, into your sword.'—Jerrold's *Folly of the Sword*.

Let us now, as was proposed, look at war in its motive. 'From whence come wars and fightings among you?' asks an apostle.

'What did they kill each other for?' asks the child, in the ballad. The answer of James I. well knows. 'He gives the Christian answer. The ballad avoids the question somewhat. The child is told,

'It was a glorious victory.'

Perhaps, few have a better reply at hand. What is the motive for war? A few weeks since, in Congress, when the question was on the army supplies, a member, I think, from New-Hampshire, moved that the appropriation for the West Point Military Academy should be struck from the bill. He gave his reasons for his proposed amendment. As soon as he had taken his seat, a member from South Carolina rose, and opposed the amendment. He said that if the amendment prevailed, he would at once move that the permanent peace establishment should be immediately increased to many thousands, and a contingent army of two hundred thousand more be at once provided, in order to be ready for a war,—I think, with Mexico. What the war was to be, he did not say, or exactly what he would make it; but he was surely to be, if the appropriation for West Point were not voted. Here was a member of the American Congress, the war-making body, too, for the country, who was ready to fight with any body, if a paltry item in an appropriation bill should fail. Does not the answer to the grandchild's question, the ballad says, as much, if not more, for the war-motive, than did that speech of the honorable member from South Carolina? The motive for war is never very distant where the war-spirit is; and a very slight one ordinarily suffices.

'To my shame,' says Hamlet, 'I see
The imminent death of twenty thousand men,
That, for a fantasy, and trick of fame,
Go to their graves like beds; fight for a plot,
Whereon the numbers cannot try the cause,
Which is not traved enough, and continent,
To hide the slain.'

We have seen that war is physical in its nature, and in its means. Is it not in its motive? Look at its preparation. What is that army—that fort—that ship—that arsenal, but so many substantial causes of war? Do they not contain a 'foregone conclusion'? Are they not promise and prophecy of war? Why this waste of mind, of money, of men—of the poor man's hard earnings, and the rich man's wealth, in this long race, but to be ready for war; and if to be ready, what else can their agency be, but to produce it? This is it which gives birth to the current honor of nations, and this it is which finds an insult of that honor, in the most trifling differences in the every-day relations and business of nations. You say that this preparation is to prevent peace. And surely, from fear, never, never from true courage. The nation would shake England from her property, by its mighty armaments, its war-ships, its invincible fortresses, its vast armies. And England proposes to scare us into continued peace by its greater war preparation. The peace of nations, while the balance is tolerably well kept, international good behavior is thought to be secured, and peace preserved.

What is there in this worthy a man's or a nation's time for a single moment? Is it not mere child's play, a real weakness, an ever present fear, covered over, indeed, and very poorly, too, by an assumed manliness, and a noisy courage? Or rather, is it not the supremacy of the physical over the moral, the rational, the sublime, and the noble in man?

From the Practical Christian.

The Regenerator.

This is the title of a weekly paper published last six months in New-York city, and edited by Orson S. Murray, formerly of the Brandon, Vt. Telegraph. It is printed on a handsome sheet, in very good typographical style, at \$2 per annum. We peruse by the last No. that it is to be removed to West Liberty, Logan Co. Ohio, and to be suspended till the first of January next, unless favorable circumstances should warrant its resumption sooner. We have regularly received two copies of the paper at this place, and have been struck by the radical, eccentric doctrines, but always with much interest. We feel indebted to the publishers for their kindness in furnishing our community with their paper. Probably we are altogether too superstitious and ignorant to become proselytes to the distinguishing religious tenets of the Regenerator. No able physician could be speedily converted to its physiological faith and practice on all points. But as narrow minded and sectarian as some professed reformers choose to consider us, we have courage and firmness enough to read the Regenerator, and to assay the mastication, if not the digestion, of its strong meat. We like its freedom of investigation; we like its honest frankness; we like its bold spirit; and we like its great deal that it says. But we do not like its anti-Christianity—its contempt of things which we hold sacred—its infidelity—albeit we are infidels to the fashionable religion of the day. For all this, we say to friend Murray, speak out freely and boldly. You cannot throw out any thing false, and truth with rectitude. Use your rights, and take your chance. Nobody is obliged to endorse your dicta, and you bid all to dissent wheresoever their convictions require them. When we have as little faith in the Bible, in Christ, in spiritualism, and in religion as you have, and as much in the omnipotence of physiology, doubtless we shall think and speak your dialect. Till then, we must remain loyal to our old and to Jesus Christ and his religion, as the means of human salvation.

Friend Murray says in his last, respecting the Bible—'I do verily deem it to be candor and moderation when I say, that all other books I have ever read are together, but the dust of the balance compared with that book, is but a speck, and a very small one. I said before, the book in general is to be taken for authority, as coming from the source of purity and goodness! Pah! How can a man physiologically lead headed make such an assertion? It is utterly extravagant. Be the Bible what it may, it cannot be made out such a thing as this. Our knowledge, which we have won for us along with our sins, is a knowledge which we have won for us along with our sins. It is best for them to avoid morbid anticipations, and splenetic extravagance, even against the old book; which rightly used, may turn out to be the best of books, after all.'

Again, speaking of Christ, he says—'He teaches that a man is not defiled by what he eats and drinks. It is a matter of indifference, then, as to his purity, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits.' Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees about eating with unwashed hands. To eat with unwashed hands from cups and platters not formally purified, was held to defile men. Christ rejected these groundless traditions of the Pharisees, as he right or wrong? Is it not to be effected much, whether he drinks rum and beer, and eats carrion, salt, opium and tobacco, or drinks pure water and eats wholesome fruits? Now what candor is there in this? Is this misrepresentation of the meaning of Jesus the result of the new dietetics, abstinence and hair-growth? Was Jesus speaking physiologically, or was he speaking of the root of evil, and did not eat, and did not drink on the consummation? Not at all. But with sole reference to the tradition ceremonies of the Pharisees